



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/485,559	02/11/2000	SARA W. BOEHMER	FL1049USPCT	6181
23906	7590	06/15/2007	EXAMINER	
E I DU PONT DE NEMOURS AND COMPANY LEGAL PATENT RECORDS CENTER BARLEY MILL PLAZA 25/1128 4417 LANCASTER PIKE WILMINGTON, DE 19805			MANOHARAN, VIRGINIA	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		1764		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		06/15/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/485,559	BOEHMER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Virginia Manoharan	1764	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 March 2007.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 13-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 13-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 13-21 and 31-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO A -9703936 or Miller (6,156,161) and EP -A 0626362

The above references are applied for the same combined reasons as set forth at page 2 through page 3, lines 1-2 of the previous Office Action.

Claims 22-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mahler et al (5,830,325) and EP 0626362.

The above references are applied for the same combined reasons as set forth at page 3 of the previous Office Action.

Applicants' arguments filed March 19,2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants' arguments such as : “..EP' 362 does not teach, disclose or otherwise suggest how extractive agents are going to affect the relative volatility of HFC-32 with regard to CFC-12, HFC-143a and CFC-115... ... Besides, it is unexpected whether HFC-32 would become more or less volatile relative to CFC-12, HFC-143a and CFC-115 respectively in the presence of an extractive agent...” are not persuasive of patentability because of the following reasons:

Art Unit: 1764

As previously discussed, on file, EP '362 in combination with WO '936 or Miller '161 render obvious the separation of HFC-32 with regard to CFC-12, HFC-143a and CFC-115 by extractive distillation thereby inherently affecting "the relative volatility of HFC-32 with regard to CFC-12, HFC-143a and CFC-115" as argued. Applicants are arguing the reference to EP '362 individually, while the rejection is based on a combination of references. Furthermore and contrary to applicants' assertion that "HFC-32 would become more or less volatile relative to CFC-12, HFC-143a and CFC-115 respectively in the presence of an extractive agent" is expected, not unexpected. The EP reference discloses in the abstract, an extractive distillation process. An artisan knows that distillation is a physical unit of operation based on boiling point characteristic, not necessarily involving a chemical reaction, and since extractive distillation involves distillation in the presence of an auxiliary agent (relatively nonvolatile compared to the components to be distilled with substantial concentration being maintained in the liquid phase of the distillation column or tower; and chosen to enhance the relative volatility of the components to be distilled) any nonvolatiles, if present, would naturally or inherently be removed with the agent.

Thus, in the absence of anything which may be "new" or "unexpected result," a prima facie case of obviousness has been reasonably established by the art and has not been rebutted. Unexpected results must be established by factual evidence. Mere arguments or conclusory statements in the specification, applicants' amendments, or the Brief do not suffice. In re Linder, 457 F.2d 506, 508, 173 USPQ 356, 358 (CCPA 1872). In re Wood, 582, F.2d 638, 642, 199 USPQ 137, 140 (CCPA 1978).

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Replacing “comprising” in all independent claims with ----consisting of ---or ---consisting essentially of---would preclude the prior art feedstream to be separated; and would place the case on condition for allowance.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Virginia Manoharan whose telephone number is 571-272-1450.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Calderola, can be reached on 571-272-1444.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-272-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

Art Unit: 1764

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



VIRGINIA MANOHARAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 123 1764